

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Examiner objected to the Abstract. The Abstract has been replaced with an Abstract of less than one hundred fifty (150) words as suggested by Examiner.

Examiner objected to parts of the disclosure. Page 1 of the disclosure has been amended as kindly suggested by Examiner. An IDS has been submitted disclosing the references cited on pages 3 and 4 of the disclosure as suggested by Examiner.

Examiner objected to the language of claim 2. Reference to provisional application has been removed as suggested by Examiner.

Examiner rejected claims 1 - 20 as drawn to merely an abstract idea not tied to the technical art. Claims 1 - 20 have now been amended to more clearly point out that the claimed method requires hardware to implement. Specifically, at least the memory is part of hardware.

Claims 1 - 21 are in the case. With this amendment, claims 1 - 3 and 12 have been cancelled.

Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 112 as indefinite. The terms "L" and "Z" and "equi-likely" have been removed. The claims have been further amended to clarify antecedent basis for terms in all the claims.

Claims 1 - 3 and 12 have been cancelled and the limitations of those claims included in claims 4 - 11 and 13 - 21 which were indicated to be allowable by Examiner if amended to contain the limitations of their base claims.

For the foregoing reasons, it is felt that the remaining claims are now in condition for allowance.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the remarks above it is felt that the remaining claims are now in condition for allowance.

In the event the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

by: Peter C. Massey 1/9/2006  
Peter C. Massey, Applicant and Inventor  
574-272-8538